

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application. Claim 1 has been amended.

In paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7 and 9-12 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by German patent no. DE19918055A1 (“Richter”). The applicant respectfully submits that the device of Richter does not anticipate the amended claim 1, and claims 11 and 12 as filed.

To further clarify the claimed invention, the applicant amends claim 1 to expressly recited that the housing for the mobile handset has “a key opening.” An example of such a key opening is illustrated in Fig. 2 of specification as reference character 31, and is further described on page 5, lines 12-15 of the specification. Claim 1 also recites that there is “a graphical element positioned adjacent the key opening ...” that is “indicative of a key function.” By way of example, Fig. 2 shows a graphical element 28, which is “located nearest the key that the user must press to active the function indicated by the graphical elements.” Specification, page 5, lines 18-19. By placing the graphical element adjacent to the key opening, the graphical element is not constantly being contacted by the user’s fingertips, which allows less wear and fading of the graphical element. *See*, Specification, page 2, lines 19-22.

In contrast, Richter does not disclose any graphical element adjacent a key opening. Instead, Richter has a logo made in one piece with a display field cover. *See* Richter Translation, page 3, lines 15-18. As shown in Fig. 1a of Richter, the display field 11 is separate and distinct from the keyfield 9, which holds the keys. Further, Richter does not address providing information regarding a key function, but is merely constructed to be highly contrasting from the phone’s display area. *See* Richter Translation, page 4, lines 7-10. Since Richter fails to disclose all the elements of amended claim 1, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, and its dependent claims 2-10, can not be anticipated by Richter.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 11, and respectfully submits that Richter fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 11. For example, claim 11 recites “a translucent housing” with “an opaque coating upon at least said outer surface of the housing.” In sharp contrast, Richter has a separate display field cover 11’ that may be

made of transparent plastic. *See Richter Translation*, page 7, lines 3-7, and Fig. 1a. A logo or a logo-cutout is provided in the display field cover, with the display field cover then inserted into the display field housing section. *See Richter Translation*, page 6, lines 21-25. In this way, Richter has only a limited transparent cover piece that is separately assembled into a housing. Since Richter fails to disclose a transparent housing, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 can not be anticipated by Richter.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 12, and respectfully submits that Richter also fails to disclose all the limitations of claim 12. For example, claim 12 has a split housing comprising a “front portion,” with the front portion defined to include “a plurality of spaced apart keys.” By way of example, Fig. 2 of the specification shows a front housing 12 with a typical key arrangement. In claim 12, the front portion is recited to be “formed from a light transmitting material.” In contrast, Richter has a separate display field cover 11’ that may be made of transparent plastic. *See Richter Translation*, page 7, lines 3-7, and Fig. 1a. A logo or a logo-cutout is provided in the display field cover, with the display field cover then inserted into the display field housing section. *See Richter Translation*, page 6, lines 21-25. In this way, Richter has only a limited transparent cover piece that is separately assembled into a housing. Since Richter fails to disclose a transparent front housing, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 12 can not be anticipated by Richter.

In paragraphs 3 and 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 USC §103(a) as being anticipated by German patent no. DE19918055A1 (“Richter”). However, applicant submits that claim 8 is allowable due to its dependency from claim 1, which is now believed to be in a condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-12 are now in a condition for allowance. If the Examiner would find it useful, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 24, 2004

By:



Lee Hsu, Esq.  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No.: 39,716

Lee Hsu, Esq.  
KYOCERA WIRELESS CORP.  
P.O. Box 928289  
San Diego, California 92192-8289  
Direct Dial: (858) 882-1950  
Direct Fax: (858) 882-2485